

Remarks

Reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 2, 4-8 and 10-13 have been amended. Claims 1 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 33-35 have been added. Claims 2-11 and 13-35 are pending.

I. Amendments

The specification has been amended to provide the application serial number and the status of the referenced application.

Claim 6, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been rewritten into independent form. As a result, claim 1 has been canceled. Claims 2, 4-5, 7-8 and 10-11 have been amended to depend from claim 6.

Claim 17, which was indicated as containing allowable subject matter, has been rewritten into independent form. As a result, claim 12 has been canceled. Claims 13-16 and 18-20 have been amended to depend from claim 17.

Claim 13 has additionally been amended to remove the language concerning the socket permitting and preventing fluid communication.

New claim 33 is a combination of claims 1 and 5, where claim 5 was indicated as being allowable.

New claim 34 is a combination of claims 1 and 11, where claim 11 was indicated as being allowable.

New claim 35 is a combination of claims 12 and 20, where claim 20 was indicated as being allowable.

No new matter has been added by these amendments.

II. Rejections

Claims 1-4, 7-10, 12-16, 18-19, 24-27 and 30-32 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over, US Patent 5,803,108 to Schuessler Jr. et al. (Schuessler).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and reconsideration is requested in view of the following.

A. Claims 1-11

With respect to claim 1, claim 6 has been rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 1. Claim 1 has been canceled. Therefore, claims 2-11 should be allowable.

B. Claims 12-20

With respect to claim 12, claim 17 has been rewritten into independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 12. Claim 12 has been canceled. Therefore, claims 13-20 should be allowable.

C. Claim 24

Schuessler does not teach or suggest a body as claimed having a hex, in addition to a removal/insertion mechanism having a drive hex.

As disclosed in Applicant's specification, the use of a body hex and a drive hex allows the body to hold the valve seat, which has a corresponding hex head, thereby preventing rotation of the valve seat as the valve core is inserted into or removed from the valve seat (see, e.g., page 11, lines 3-6).

In the rejection, the drive hex and body hex are asserted to be obvious in view of elements 47 and 109 of Schuessler. However, Schuessler does not teach any feature that performs a function similar to the body hex, and therefore the hex on the body is not taught or suggested by Schuessler. In Schuessler, the tool 21 includes a valve stem connector 55 that is configured to secure the tool 21 to a valve stem 25. As shown in Figures 3C, 3D and 5, the majority of the valve stem 25 is surrounded by a sleeve that is secured to the rim R of the wheel W (column 3, lines 32-36; Figure 1). The outer end 31 of the valve stem projects past the sleeve so that the connector 55 can attach to the outer end. The outer end 31 of the valve stem is cylindrical with threads.

Schuessler does not teach or suggest configuring the connector 55 to connect with the valve stem in a manner to prevent rotation of the valve stem while rotating the valve core. Schuessler is silent regarding the problem of rotation of the valve stem. Further, in order for

Schuessler to have a body hex, the valve stem in Schuessler would need to have a structure, such as a hex head, with which the body hex would mate. Schuessler does not disclose or suggest configuring the valve stem in such a manner. Moreover, Schuessler does not disclose or suggest a hex on either the body or the head 109, let alone using a combination of a hex on the body and a drive hex on a removal/insertion mechanism.

For at least these reasons, claim 24 is patentable over Schuessler.

D. Claims 25-27

Schuessler does not teach or suggest a method of performing processing operations as claimed, that includes removing a valve core from a valve seat.

As disclosed in Applicant's specification, the service tool is capable of removing a valve core from a valve seat and inserting a valve core into the valve seat (see, e.g., page 3, lines 24-25). To accomplish this, the removal/insertion mechanism is described as including a retaining mechanism that is configured to secure the valve core to the removal/insertion mechanism as the removal/insertion mechanism travels from the first position to the second position (see, e.g., page 10, lines 18-23; and page 14, line 27 to page 15, line 7). An advantage of the tool is that the tool can be used with existing valves to replace an existing valve core with a new valve core.

Schuessler discloses a tool 21 that is for inserting a valve core 27 into a valve stem 25 after a filter element 71 has been inserted into the valve stem 25 (column 2, line 59 to column 3, line 2). The tool 21 includes a plunger 107 that can reciprocate in the tool (column 6, line 61 to column 7, line 3). The plunger 107 includes a head 109 that is forked to fit over flats 47 on the valve core 27 (column 7, lines 17-19). The head 109 engages with the flats 47 to drive the valve core 27 toward the valve stem 25 as the plunger 107 is pushed toward the valve stem, with the forked configuration of the head 109 and the flats 47 causing rotation of the valve core in order to screw the valve core into the valve stem upon rotation of the plunger 107 (column 7, lines 19-20 and column 10, lines 7-13).

The tool 21 in Schuessler can only insert a valve core into the valve stem, or unscrew a valve core from the valve stem. The tool 21 in Schuessler is not designed to remove the valve core 27 from the valve stem 25. The tool 21 is only capable of inserting the valve core into the valve stem. As a result, Schuessler does not teach a step of removing a valve core from a valve seat as claimed.

For at least these reasons, claim 25, along with claims 26-27 depending therefrom, are patentable over Schuessler.

E. Claims 30-32

Schuessler does not teach or suggest a tool that is attachable to a pneumatic gun, where the tool includes a holding head with a first end adapted to connect to a housing of a pneumatic gun and a second end formed with an internal hex, and a drive head within the holding head and having a first end adapted for connection to a drive element of the pneumatic gun and a second end provided with a socket for driving the valve core. The tool to which this claim pertains is illustrated in Figures 11 and 12A, 12B.

Schuessler does not disclose or suggest that the tool 21 is attachable to a pneumatic gun. Further, Schuessler does not teach or suggest a holding head with a first end adapted to connected to a housing of the pneumatic gun and a second end formed with an internal hex. There is simply no indication from Schuessler that the tool 21 could connect to a pneumatic gun, or how such connection would be accomplished. Still further, Schuessler does not teach or suggest a drive head that includes a first end adapted for connection to a drive element of the pneumatic gun and a second end with a socket for driving the valve core. The only element in Schuessler that drives the valve core is elements 107 and 109. However, there is no teaching as to how the element 107 would connect to a drive element of a pneumatic gun. Even if the element 107 could connect to a pneumatic gun, there is no teaching as how both the element 107 and the housing of the tool would both connect to the pneumatic gun.

For at least these reasons, claim 30, along with claims 31-32 depending therefrom, are patentable over Schuessler.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

The indicated allowability of the subject matter of claims 5-6, 11, 17 and 20, and the allowance of claims 21-23 and 28-29, are gratefully noted. As indicated above, the remaining claims are believed to be allowable as well.

IV. Conclusion


In view of the above amendments and remarks, all claims should now be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned with any remaining questions regarding this application.



Dated: May 11, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

By 
James A. Larson
Reg. No. 40,443